

REMARKS

Claims

In the Office Action, claims 1-35 were allowed and claims 36-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,711,039 to Brkovic. In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 36 and 39 to overcome the rejection as set forth below.

Applicants have amended claim 36 to clarify that the claimed method includes “modulating the amplitude of the gate voltage of the synchronous rectifier to thereby control conduction of the synchronous rectifier in proportion to the differentiated output voltage.” Support for this amendment may be found throughout the present application as filed, including paragraph [0021].

Brkovic does not disclose or suggest modulating the amplitude of the gate voltage of the synchronous rectifier to thereby control the conduction of the synchronous rectifier in proportion to the differentiated output voltage. Rather, in Brkovic the conduction of the synchronous rectifiers is controlled by modulating the *on time* of the rectifiers by a digital means – not by modulating the gate voltage of the synchronous rectifiers. That is, in the Brkovic circuit the time derivative of the output voltage is compared to a predetermined level. When the time derivative has gone negative greater than this predetermined level the synchronous rectifiers are completely disabled by digital circuitry (logic gates 501 and 502). Thus, the gate voltage of the synchronous rectifiers is not modulated in Brkovic – there is no varying of the gate voltage to control the conduction of the synchronous rectifier. Rather, the synchronous rectifiers in Brkovic are either completely on or completely disabled. Accordingly, Brkovic does not anticipate amended claim 36.

Dependent claims 37 and 38 have been amended to be in accordance with the amendments made to claim 36, from which claims 37 and 38 depend. By virtue of their dependence upon claim 36, as well as by the additional features recited respectively in claims 37 and 38, Brkovic does not anticipate claims 37 and 38.

Independent claim 39 has been amended in a fashion similar to claim 36, and dependent claim 40 has been amend to be in accordance with the amendments made to claim 39. For analogous reasons, Brkovic does not anticipate claims 39 and 40.

Drawings

Also enclosed are formal drawings for the application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to the

undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below in order that the Examiner's concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 17, 2004



Mark G. Knedeisen
Reg. No. 42,747

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Ph. (412) 355-6342
Fax (412) 355-6501